

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

TRANSLATION

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To:

Date of mailing
(day/month/year)

Applicant's or agent's file reference

5093-PCT

FOR FURTHER ACTION

See paragraph 2 below

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/001631

International filing date (day/month/year)

28.01.2005

Priority date (day/month/year)

28.01.2004

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

Applicant

KYOCERA CORPORATION

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☒ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/JP

Authorized officer

Facsimile No.

Telephone No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/001631

Box No. I

Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material
☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material
☐ in written format
☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing
☐ contained in the international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/001631

Box No. II

Priority

1. ☐ The following document has not yet been furnished:

☐ copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(a)).

☐ translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(b)).

Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date in the claimed priority date.

2. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43bis.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.

3. Additional observations, if necessary:

Since matters described in claims 8-11 do not appear to be disclosed in the application which is a base of claim of priority (JP2004-020289), the relevant date of the said claim shall be the international filing date.

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/001631

Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement		
1. Statement			
Novelty (N)	Claims	4, 6-7, 9-11	YES
	Claims	1-3, 5, 8	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims		YES
	Claims	1-11	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-11	YES
	Claims		NO
2. Citations and explanations:			
<p>Document 1: JP, 2002-168062, A (Sanyo Electric Co., Ltd.), 11 June, 2002 (11.06.02)</p> <p>Document 2: JP, 11-31834, A (Showa Shell Sekiyu Kabushiki Kaisha), 2 February, 1999 (02.02.99)</p> <p>Document 3: JP, 2002-111035, A (Sanyo Electric Co., Ltd.), 12 April, 2002 (12.04.02)</p> <p>Document 4: JP, 2004-146791, A (Kyocera Corp.), 20 May, 2004 (20.05.04)</p> <p>(1) Document 1 discloses a solar battery module having solar battery element arrays 2a and 2b consisting of double-sided generation type solar battery elements. Document 2 also discloses double-sided glass sandwich type solar battery panel 1B (paragraphs [0023]-[0025] and Fig. 4).</p> <p>(2) Therefore, the subject matters of claims 1-3, 5 and 8 do not appear to be novel in view of document 1 mentioned above and in view of document 2.</p> <p>(3) The matters stated in claims 4, 6-7 and 9 do not appear to involve an inventive step in view of document 1 and in view of document 2 since those are considered to be nothing but a matter of design variation (particularly regarding claims 6-7, also see document 3).</p> <p>(4) The subject matters of claims 10-11 do not appear to involve an inventive step in view of document 1 and in view of document 2 since providing a voltage regulating means is considered to be nothing but a well-known prior art for a photovoltaic generation device (see, for example, document 4). As to the relevant date of these claims, also give heed to Box. No. II (Right of priority).</p>			

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

TRANSLATION

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To:

Date of mailing
(day/month/year)

Applicant's or agent's file reference

5093-PCT

FOR FURTHER ACTION

See paragraph 2 below

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/001631

International filing date (day/month/year)

28.01.2005

Priority date (day/month/year)

28.01.2004

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

Applicant

KYOCERA CORPORATION

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☒ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/JP

Authorized officer

Facsimile No.

Telephone No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/001631

Box No. I

Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language
_____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material
☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material
☐ in written format
☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing
☐ contained in the international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/001631

Box No. II

Priority

1. ☐ The following document has not yet been furnished:

☐ copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(a)).

☐ translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(b)).

Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date in the claimed priority date.

2. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43bis.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.

3. Additional observations, if necessary:

Since matters described in claims 8-11 do not appear to be disclosed in the application which is a base of claim of priority (JP2004-020289), the relevant date of the said claim shall be the international filing date.

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/001631

Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement		
1. Statement			
Novelty (N)	Claims	4, 6-7, 9-11	YES
	Claims	1-3, 5, 8	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims		YES
	Claims	1-11	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-11	YES
	Claims		NO
2. Citations and explanations:			
<p>Document 1: JP, 2002-168062, A (Sanyo Electric Co., Ltd.), 11 June, 2002 (11.06.02)</p> <p>Document 2: JP, 11-31834, A (Showa Shell Sekiyu Kabushiki Kaisha), 2 February, 1999 (02.02.99)</p> <p>Document 3: JP, 2002-111035, A (Sanyo Electric Co., Ltd.), 12 April, 2002 (12.04.02)</p> <p>Document 4: JP, 2004-146791, A (Kyocera Corp.), 20 May, 2004 (20.05.04)</p> <p>(1) Document 1 discloses a solar battery module having solar battery element arrays 2a and 2b consisting of double-sided generation type solar battery elements. Document 2 also discloses double-sided glass sandwich type solar battery panel 1B (paragraphs [0023]-[0025] and Fig. 4).</p> <p>(2) Therefore, the subject matters of claims 1-3, 5 and 8 do not appear to be novel in view of document 1 mentioned above and in view of document 2.</p> <p>(3) The matters stated in claims 4, 6-7 and 9 do not appear to involve an inventive step in view of document 1 and in view of document 2 since those are considered to be nothing but a matter of design variation (particularly regarding claims 6-7, also see document 3).</p> <p>(4) The subject matters of claims 10-11 do not appear to involve an inventive step in view of document 1 and in view of document 2 since providing a voltage regulating means is considered to be nothing but a well-known prior art for a photovoltaic generation device (see, for example, document 4). As to the relevant date of these claims, also give heed to Box. No. II (Right of priority).</p>			